

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 NATHAN JEROME ELLIS

11 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-03-1938 LKK CMK P

12 vs.

13 MIKE KNOWLES, et al.,

14 Defendants.

15 \_\_\_\_\_ / ORDER


16 Plaintiff is a prisoner proceeding pro se an in forma pauperis with a civil rights  
17 action under 42 U.S.C. §1983. This proceeding was referred to the undersigned by Local Rule  
18 72-302 by the authority of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Currently before the court is plaintiff's  
19 "Request for Enlargement of Time to File Motion to Compel."

20 In support of his motion, plaintiff states that he is requesting an extension for the  
21 purpose of "allowing defendants an opportunity to respond to his request for the production of  
22 documents." It is clear from plaintiff's attached declaration that defendants have responded to  
23 plaintiff's request for discovery directed toward C.D. Brown. Plaintiff complains that the  
24 discovery is "deficient" because it is not organized in a manner acceptable to him. While  
25 plaintiff has a right to discovery, he does not have a right to discovery organized to suit his  
26 preferences. Plaintiff should be mindful of this when filing any future motions.

///

1 IT IS ORDERED THAT plaintiff's request for an enlargement of time to file a  
2 motion to compel (doc. 48) is DENIED.

3  
4 DATED: December 4, 2005.

5  
6   
7 **CRAIG M. KELLISON**  
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26